

USEPA AMCO Proposed Plan Workshop, March 12, 2011

EPA Attendees: Rose Marie Caraway
Leana Rosetti

EPA Contractors: Kent Baugh/ITSI
Yash Nyznyk/CDM
Carolyn Moore/CDM
Frankie Watson/ CH2M Hill
Eli Moore/ Pacific Institute

Community Members:

Daniel Vigil	Alan Miller	Brian Beveridge
Nick Robinson	Jessica Wong	Ellen Parkinson
Monsa Nitoto	Edmund Ye	Phoebe Rositer
Nu Nhi Nguyen	Eric Gerrick	Brent Bucknum
Gabrielle Keane	John Schweizer	Brian Beveridge
Margaret Gordon	Kerri Atwood	Ellen Parkinson
Eric Maundu	Rafael Navarro	
Daniel Vigil	Rocio Navarro	

Purpose of Meeting

- *Provide a clear understanding of the decisions that are going to be made during the Proposed Plan phase of the Superfund process and define criteria that are going to be applied in the course of making those decisions.*
- *Discuss at what point in the process specific community concerns will be addressed and where information pertaining to community concerns will be documented.*
- *Review the components included in a typical proposed plan, understand how these components are organized, and gather input on how best to present the AMCO Proposed Plan*
- *Draft goals and priorities for the second Proposed Plan workshop.*

Welcome & Introductions

Eli Moore, Workshop Facilitator, and Leana Rosetti, EPA Community Involvement Coordinator (CIC) and EPA Community Advisory Group (CAG) Co-Chair, and Brian Beveridge, Community CAG Co-Chair

- Facilitators introduced the purpose of the meeting and the structure of the meeting.
- Posters were placed around the room and attendees were given the chance to visit each poster during the poster session, which was held before the start of the meeting.

Superfund Process Poster Discussion

Eli Moore, Workshop Facilitator

- Mr. Moore directed attendees' attention to the "Superfund Process Poster". The poster depicts elements of the Superfund Process and highlights opportunities for community input.
- Mr. Moore invited community members to write concerns on post-it notes and place it on the process poster where they think that specific concern would be addressed.
- Comments/Concerns:

- When will the community jobs be generated?
- EPA administration has sustainability goals, including local job creation, but the community members are not seeing those goals reflected in the established procedures. The process as shown does not highlight where sustainability is taken into account. Once the ROD has been signed and contracts are being put in place for the work, this is when local hiring would be addressed. Community input on sustainability aspects is important.
- There is no reliable method for gaining knowledge about new developments at the Site. The current sign is out of date; the bulletin board needs to be updated. Additional suggestions included updates in different languages; more visual presentation of information; posting a map of the Site showing the areas of concern and the surrounding houses at the bulletin board.
 - The EPA responded that 2 new bulletin boards have been erected in front of South Prescott Park and are currently updated every time there is a meeting. One board on the bulletin board is for community postings and one is for EPA announcements. Suggestion of more visual information will be heeded. The old bulletin board in front of the site can be taken down to avoid confusion.
 - Community prefers old bulletin board to stay in front of site, but maybe just use it to refer people to the new ones.
- When will the Interim Remedial Action be taking place? What are the dates on this process? When will the tent [enclosure to control vapor exposure] be in-place at the site? When will the decision be made whether to use a tent or not?
 - The EPA anticipates that if the Interim Remedial Action is implemented as proposed, the tent will only be in-place during excavation of the source area (only a few months of the entire 10 months of operation).
- How long will the temporary relocation be and where is it on this poster?
 - If the Interim Remedial Action moves forward as proposed, the temporary relocation will be for a maximum of 10 months. Details of the proposed Interim Remedial Action will likely be presented at the next meeting in May. The plan will be undergoing review at the federal level during April and is not yet finalized.
- Is it possible to hire someone within the community to interview community members and gather comments on the Proposed Plan? This would ensure that people are not too intimidated to comment.
- Brian Beveridge, community member and CAG Community Co-Chair – Mr. Beveridge emphasized that it's important to have a sense of when the official public comment period is occurring because it is during this comment period that comments regarding the plan will be documented and will become part of the public record for the decision process.
- What is the best way to get comments in during this process?
 - EPA responded that comments will be accepted by letter, email and during the public meeting. The EPA is committed to reaching community members that do not have access to email or regular access to computers.

Example Proposed Plan Discussion

Leana Rosetti EPA CIC and EPA CAG Co-Chair

- Ms. Rosetti provided an example Proposed Plan from the Intel Santa Clara 3 Superfund Site.
- The example Plan consisted of sections included in a typical Proposed Plan.
- It is important to keep in mind that a Proposed Plan is a summary of large amounts of information, including the site background, results of site remedial investigations and the feasibility study, which provides the full description of the potential cleanup alternatives and details the analytical process.

- The Proposed Plan Workshop in May will discuss details specific to the AMCO Superfund Site but this document is intended to give the community members a sense of what information is presented in a Proposed Plan and how the information is formatted.
- The EPA would like feedback and suggestions on how best to present the Proposed Plan for the Interim Remedial Action.
- Community Concerns/ Comments:
 - Mr. Beveridge – In this document [the example Proposed Plan from Intel Santa Clara 3], information is presented which assesses whether each alternative meets or does not meet the criteria; however, an in-depth analysis is not presented. The document does not include details about the preferred alternative. Also, the first few pages seem to be supplementary, covering general site history and background information. It would be nice if the first thing presented were an outline or executive summary.
 - Pictures of the plume or extent of impacts would be nice. Visuals are easier to understand than written information. Pictorial depictions of the alternatives, highlighting their differences would be useful. Also, a picture of the Site Conceptual Model would be informative.
 - Mr. Beveridge – It's important that this document speak to people who are new to the process and have not been engaged in the CAG since the beginning, including people who have not been in contact with John Schweizer (the CAG Technical Adviser).
 - EPA – The methodology for developing a Proposed Plan is constantly being changed and the EPA is open to suggestions that will improve the document. There is a template for Proposed Plans and there are required elements but there is considerable latitude outside of those required elements where Ms. Rosetti and Ms. Caraway can add elements. Examples would include an executive summary or additional graphic materials.
 - Community members indicated that they would like: more robust description of alternatives, including graphic depictions or photographs; summary box or executive summary; vocabulary section or glossary of terms; and table of contents. In addition, the community members suggested that the community participation section, describing how to comment on the Proposed Plan, be presented on the first page of the Proposed Plan.

Superfund Process Poster Discussion

Eli Moore, Workshop Facilitator

- Mr. Moore introduced the next activity.
- Cards containing evaluation criteria terms and definitions for the 9 evaluation criteria considered in a feasibility study were handed out to each table. Teams composed of table members were instructed to match terms to definitions.
- After matching exercise the large group reconvened to discuss the 9 evaluation criteria and address any questions.
- Community Comments/ Concerns:
 - What is the difference between *Overall Protection of Human Health and the Environment* and *Reduction of Toxicity, Mobility or Volume through Treatment*?
 - EPA – The *Overall Protection of Human Health and the Environment* criteria primarily addresses whether the remedial alternative decreases **risk** to both human and ecological receptors, whereas the *Reduction of Toxicity, Mobility or Volume through Treatment* considers whether the actual quantity of contaminants has decreased.
 - How are *Overall Protection of Human Health and the Environment* and *Compliance with ARARs* different?
 - EPA – A good example of the difference is the remedial action objectives at the Intel Santa Clara 3 Superfund Site. The Human Health Risk Assessment finds no risk to human health from contaminant levels at the site but the levels do not meet legal requirements for San Francisco Bay Area groundwater quality.
 - How is *Short-Term Effectiveness* defined?
 - EPA – Short-term effectiveness examines whether the community and site workers are safe while the remedy is being implemented. The goal is not to increase risk while remediating the site.

- When the EPA finds a site and they have an expedited cleanup or response action, where does that fit into these criteria and within the Superfund Process?
 - EPA – That is an Emergency Response Action that is part of a different program administered under the EPA. Sometimes Emergency actions are implemented within the Superfund Process ie before or after a site becomes a Superfund Site.
- Where does local government (county or city public health programs) acceptance come into play?
 - EPA – Local laws and ordinance are considered in the ARARs. Additionally, input from the City, County and State are accepted during the open comment period and those comments may influence modifications to the proposed remedy.
- A community member commented that there should be a dialogue between the local public health department and the EPA regarding the cleanup of the AMCO Chemical Superfund Site. There needs to be official channels for the local public health department to learn about and influence actions at the site because the local public health department has to deal with any health problems that arise due to the site and any remedial actions.
 - EPA – a well designed remedy will result in no impacts to the community. That said, the comment regarding establishing a dialogue with the local health department is noted.
- Mr. Beveridge – When making a comment about the Proposed Plan, it is important to note which criterion the comment falls under. If you have a personal interest that falls within one of the more stringently applied criteria, one of the criteria that are required or evaluated and balanced, rather than just considered, make sure that you word the comment in a way that brings that criterion into play. Ask yourself: “Can I move this up?”

Community Concerns and EPA Response

Rose Marie Caraway, EPA Project Manager, and Leana Rosetti, EPA CIC and EPA CAG Co-Chair

- Ms. Rosetti introduced the poster and read through the examples of where the EPA has been proactive in taking community preferences into consideration.
- Ms. Caraway pointed out one of the key examples of EPA responsiveness is the decision to clean the Site up to residential cleanup standards. Residential cleanup standards will allow for unrestricted redevelopment of the Site.
- Community Concerns/Questions:
 - Noise and hours of operation during the remedial action are community concerns. The community would like the hours of operation be limited to 8 AM to 5 PM.
 - Community would like an Emergency Contingency Plan to be in-place and available for public review.
 - Is it possible to specify that the equipment use be muffled or dampened in order to decrease noise and vibration during the remedial action? There have been examples of contractors in Burlingame and doing BART work within the neighborhood using muffled equipment in order to mitigate noise impacts.
 - John Schweizer, CAG Technical Adviser, commented that local employment was missing from the poster. Local hiring during both the interim and final remedial action has been a consistent community concern.
 - EPA – The EPA apologized for the omission. The EPA does recognize that as a community concern. No service contracts will be issued or any scopes defined until the remedial approach is decided. Also, under federal employment laws there must be an open bid process with equal competition.
 - The TA noted that Eric Maundu of Kijiji Grows is offering training to teach people to operate aquaculture systems. Aquaculture systems has been proposed as an interim use during implementation of the Final Remedial Action.
 - A community member suggested that a separate workshop be held, with community members and the TA in attendance. The community would like more information on the best approach for the Interim Remedial Action and would like to know more about the TA's recommended course of action.

Feedback and Second Workshop Goals

Eli Moore, Facilitator, and Leana Rosetti, EPA CIC and EPA CAG Co-Chair

- The community would like to see comments from communities on other proposed plans. Specifically, the community would like to see comments that resulted in modifications to planned remedial actions.
- The community would like to see more visual representations of the remedial action (e.g., figures or photographs).
- The community requested that the food at the second workshop include more vegetarian options.
- Some community members suggested that fewer printouts would be more environmentally friendly. Other community members indicated that they found the printouts to be helpful and were planning on taking the flyers home for sharing and future study.
- The community requested that the bulletin board be updated more often, with maps, presentation materials and upcoming significant dates.
- The community reiterated that it would like a separate meeting with John Schweizer, TA, in order to discuss the 9 evaluation criteria and the remedial alternatives.
- The second workshop should address the specifics of what the community would like to see in a proposed plan including an executive summary; more graphics, and the type of graphics, highlighting of the preferred alternative early in the plan and forward placement of the community involvement aspects of the plan.

Next Meetings

- AMCO Lead Meeting - March 14, 6:30 – 8:00 PM, Mandela Gateway Apartments Community Room.
- AMCO Proposed Plan Workshop - Part 2: May 7 (Saturday), 1:00 – 3:00 PM, location TBD.